

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5-12-08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claim is directed to a computer readable media; however the examiner was not able to find support for this limitation in the

Art Unit: 2617

specification. Please remember that the specification have to specify a computer readable media, a mention of an abstract software program will not suffice.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-20 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Siwko (NPL XP-001017264) in view of Redden (EP 0658014) and further in view of Iwata 6735446.

As to claim 1, Siwko discloses a communication system using a method for blocking call request comprising: receiving an initial call dropping probability factor in a calculation to determine call admission or blocking, wherein the probability is determined by a network element; determining an elapsed time from an effective time of said initial probability; adjusting said initial call request block probability based on said elapsed time (see sections II-IV). Siwko fails to disclose receiving at a mobile station an initial call request block probability. In an analog Redden discloses receiving at a mobile station an initial call request block probability (see page 14, lines 4-22), thereby letting know to the mobile station about the call request block. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these teaching to the Siwko system for the simple purpose of maintaining the quality of service by managing the network resources.

Siwko discloses that the receiving and adjusting occur at network element [note that network element can be any element connected to the network, including the mobile device] as pointed by the applicant, but it is silent regarding at which element is doing those task. In another analogous art, Iwata discloses a mobile device that receives a broadcast message that permits or inhibits the mobile device to transmit and adjust accordingly (see col. 13, line 49 – col. 14, line 40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to combine

these teachings to let the mobile station know when it is possible to transmit and make a call, without the need of the mobile station transmit when the wireless resources are not present, thereby efficiently managing the finite wireless resources.

As to claim 2, Siwko discloses the method wherein said adjusting includes decreasing said initial call request block probability (see section III formulas).

As to claims 3 and 20, Redden discloses the method further comprising: using said adjusted initial call request to block call request at a mobile station in said communication system (see page 14, lines 4-22).

As to claims 4, 10 and 16, Siwko discloses the method of receiving a time stamp associated with said probability; using said time stamp for determining said elapsed time (see sections II-III).

As to claim 6, Siwko does not disclose the following limitation taught by Redden. Redden discloses the method wherein said adjusted initial call request block probability allows fewer numbers of mobile stations to initiate call requests than a number of mobile stations allowed to initiate call requests at a time of said initial call request block probability (see page 13, lines 51-56).

As to claim 7, Siwko does not disclose the following limitation taught by Redden. Redden discloses the method further comprising: receiving a time period value, wherein said adjusting occurs at least once during a time period substantially equal to said time period value (see page 12, lines 48-50).

Regarding claims 8-9, 12-13 and 19, they are the corresponding apparatus claim of method claim 1, 3, 6-7. Therefore, claim 8 are rejected for the same reason shown above.

Regarding claims 14-15 and 18 are the corresponding system claim of method claim 1, 3 and 7. Therefore, claim 14-15 and 18 are rejected for the same reason shown above.

Regarding claim 24 is the corresponding means plus function claim of method claim 1. Therefore, claim 24 is rejected for the same reason shown above.

Regarding claim 25 is the corresponding computer readable media claim of method claim 1. Therefore, claim 25 is rejected for the same reason shown above.

9. Claims 5, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siwko in view of Redden (EP 0658014) and further in view of Iwata as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 8, 10, 14, 16 and 19 above, and further in view of Weishaupt (U.S. Patent 4,493,102).

As to claims 5, 11 and 17, Siwko discloses everything claimed as explained above except for the method of receiving a call request block termination time; terminating a call request block performed based on said adjusted initial call request block probability in a gradual process from said effective call request block termination time. Redden discloses receiving a call request block termination time; terminating a call request block (see page 11, lines 43-46). Weishaupt disclose using a gradual process (see col. 1, lines 59-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine these teachings in order to preserve the quality of service.

10. Claim 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redden in view of Siwko, and further in view of Iwata

As to claim 21, Redden discloses a communication system, an apparatus comprising: a receiver configured for receiving at the mobile station call request block (admission/refusal) information as specified by a network element, and a processor configured for determining said call request block information, wherein the block probability is determined by a network element (see page 14, lines 4-22). Redden does not specifically disclose wherein the call request block information is a percentage of calls to be blocked and adjusting said call request block information. In an analogous art, Siwko discloses wherein the call request block information is a percentage of calls to be blocked and determining elapsed time of the call request block probability and adjusting said call request block information (see sections II-IV). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to determine the elapsed time and adjust the parameters accordingly since the parameters and conditions are not constants and change with time.

Siwko discloses that the receiving and adjusting occur at network element [note that network element can be any element connected to the network, including the mobile device] as pointed by the applicant, but it is silent regarding at which element is doing those task. In another analogous art, Iwata discloses a mobile device that receives a broadcast message that permits or inhibits the mobile device to transmit and

adjust accordingly (see col. 13, line 49 – col. 14, line 40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to combine these teachings to let the mobile station know when it is possible to transmit and make a call, without the need of the mobile station transmit when the wireless resources are not present, thereby efficiently managing the finite wireless resources.

As to claim 22, Redden discloses the apparatus wherein said processor is further configured to use said adjusted initial call request to block a call (see page 14, lines 4-22).

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claim 23 is allowed.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: A method for blocking a call request at a mobile station, the method comprising: receiving at the mobile station an initial call request block probability, the initial call request block probability being a percentage of calls to be blocked as specified by a network element; receiving at the mobile station a time stamp and a time period associated with the received initial call request block probability; determining an elapsed time from an effective time of said initial call request block probability using the received time stamp; iteratively adjusting the initial call request block probability, the number of iterations being based on the ratio of the elapsed time to the received time period; generating a random number by the mobile station between minimum and maximum allowed values associated with the initial call request block probability; and blocking the

Art Unit: 2617

call request at the mobile station based on a comparison of the randomly generated number and the adjusted initial call request block probability.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARCOS L. TORRES whose telephone number is (571)272-7926. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-252-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Eng/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Marcos L Torres/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617